

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**LAKEITH AMIR-SHARIF,**

**Plaintiff ,**

**v.**

**SHERIFF DEPUTY GONZALES,  
ET AL.,**

**Defendants.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil Action No. 3:06-CV-2269-G**

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the District Court's *Order of Reference*, filed January 10, 2007, Plaintiff's *Motion for Order Directing Dallas Sheriff Valdez to Provide Plaintiff Meaningful, Adequate & Effective Access to Dallas Jail's Law Library, Photocopying Services and Indigent Legal Materials Needed*, filed January 9, 2007, was referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge for hearing, if necessary, and for determination.

The Court notes that Plaintiff, who has filed seventeen lawsuits in this district, has also filed the instant motion in at least two other of his cases. In *Amir-Sharif v. Dallas County, et al.*, No. 3:06-CV-081-B (N.D. Tex. Aug. 16, 2006), the District Court denied a substantially similar motion to the extent that it sought injunctive relief allowing him a certain number of hours of access to the prison law library because Plaintiff failed to show that he suffered actual harm by allegedly being prevented from accessing the law library. *See Order* dated August 16, 2006 (citing *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1976), *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 350-51 (1996), and *Barnes v. Cerliano*, 2006 WL 1767471, at \*3 (E.D. Tex. June 22, 2006)). Likewise, in this case, Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate any harm from the alleged denial of access. Accordingly, to


the extent that Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief in the form of an order directing the Sheriff's Office to provide him the requested access, the Court **RECOMMENDS** that the motion be **DENIED**.

**SIGNED** on this 31st day of March, 2007.

  
IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND  
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

The United States District Clerk shall serve a copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation on all parties by mailing a copy to each of them. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), any party who desires to object to these findings, conclusions and recommendation must file and serve written objections within ten days after being served with a copy. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions or recommendation to which objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusory or general objections. Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation within ten days after being served with a copy shall bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. *Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

  
IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE